

AACR3 – Part I

CONSER Comments on the December 2004 Draft

1. Objectives and principles

General comments on the formulation or application of the objectives and principles established for part I:

Scope, structure, terminology, etc.

A. Objectives:

Comprehensiveness

This revision simultaneously does too much and too little. Any significant restructuring of the rules requires a massive retooling effort by those who have developed training materials based on the current AACR2. If AACR is to be revised, then we feel that it should make the document easier to use, incorporate issues that AACR2 did not address, and be worth the considerable cost that any revision would place upon providers of standards, documentation and training, and on individual institutions' cataloguing departments. Significant changes in cataloguing practice--e.g. a close look at the use and practicality of all the data currently in a catalogue record; an ability to create expression level records, which could codify the single-record practice already in use by many libraries; rethinking card-centric punctuation – would justify a reorganization. But the changes we see in the draft are not changes of principle but largely needless tweaking of current practice (omitting the period after the abbreviation cm. is one of the most egregious examples!)

The revision's most significant accomplishments are to help the library community deal with resources that simultaneously encompass multiple formats, e.g. the infamous digital cartographic serial. By expanding terminology of the GMD, and including terms for content and medium, resources can be described better for the public (although some of the terminology suggested is not terribly intuitive or understandable to the average person--or a librarian without access to the AACR glossary). The other accomplishment of AACR3 in this area is providing guidance on precedence and order of information when the cataloguer is faced with material with multiple aspects. That seems to be all that is new. These two aspects do not seem to require a complete revamping of the existing first 13 chapters of the text of AACR2.

For serials cataloguers, the draft rule revision of Part I brings little benefit to the contents of the recently revised Chapter 12, except for some slight wording improvements in several rules. For CONSER and the SCCTP, it will require a detailed and costly revision to existing documentation, i.e., the *CONSER Cataloging Manual*, the *CONSER Editing Guide* and the four courses in the Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program. The trainers will also need to take the time to familiarize themselves with vocabulary changes (some of which seem rather unnecessary) and lots of new rule numbers, without any real corresponding significant improvement in the actual content of the cataloguing rules.

Many serials cataloguers would still like to see the rules incorporate the guidelines on “when to create a new record” that were published as an ALA publication. A cataloguer has to consider this question every time s/he has a new resource to catalogue and, with any continuing resource or multipart monograph that undergoes change, s/he needs to determine whether a new record is needed or the existing one modified.

Draft Part I does not address the multiple versions problem. Many of us are using a one-record approach to some works and would like to have that basic concept outlined – perhaps in a generalities chapter. This would be helpful for the effort to provide access to titles in aggregator databases. However, some contributors to the discussion said they would prefer that the JSC develop a plan for a multiple versions solution that really tackles the complexity of accommodating multiple versions rather than inserting something cosmetic now.

What about the cataloging of microform reproductions from former chapter 11? Couldn't we have both the U.S. and Canadian treatment addressed in the rules, perhaps both as viable options? Since we now have e-resources catalogued as reproductions, it seems even more helpful to open this to more possibilities, rather than having the U.S. treatment reside only in LCRIs. And the removal of AACR2 1.11 is not helpful to the novice cataloguer who must find all the relevant rules piecemeal.

Consistency

Clarity

Please number the rules in the introduction. Cataloguers refer to this information often and it's often helpful to be able to cite a rule number –especially when training new staff!

Rationality

Currency

Please consider removal of instructions related to catalogue card formatting, i.e., punctuation between areas. Most of us are working with online catalogues and we display records in field-by-field mode, not in a card catalogue-like format. We realize this may still be needed for institutions using the catalogue rules to produce bibliographies, etc., but the majority of users are now cataloguers working in an online environment.

Compatibility

AACR3 is no longer compatible with ISSN and ISBD (CR) (i.e., continuing resources) with its removal of the concept of “continuing resources” -- except for the glossary, which we assume was an oversight since the concept has been removed from the actual text. After a major effort in the serials community to align these two codes with AACR, dropping the concept seems to indicate a lack of interest in international compatibility – even though that is one of the expressed goals of AACR3.

Adaptability

Ease and efficiency of use

The goals of the new rules were to make the rules easier to apply, make the principles behind the rules clearer, and to make the rules more widely applicable. These are praiseworthy goals, which most of us would support. However, the product we have been presented with to date does not seem to succeed in those goals. In focusing on the trees of consistency across the chapters, the forest of usability of the rules in the real world seems to have been lost. In fact, in its print form, the new arrangement is more difficult for serials cataloguers, who will be flipping back and forth between A1 and A2 regularly, rather than primarily looking in chapter 12, as we do with print AACR2. And with all of the examples moved to the first part, it is even more irritating to have to consult another chapter for additional rules for serials or integrating resources. Hopefully, the online version will be able to merge A1 and A2 so that the cataloguer can merge the two chapters and print out the merged version – but that doesn't solve the problem for cataloguers whose institutions can't afford *Cataloguer's Desktop*.

We do not see any advantage in the proposed restructuring of Part 1 into Sections A through C, which continues the cumbersome practice in AACR2 of having to consult separate chapters of the rules in order to address a single cataloguing issue, and in fact multiplies the number of places to look in some instances. For people not familiar with the 8 areas of description, there is a need to present all information about an aspect of the resource in one place, even if it ends up in different areas of the description. For example, all information about titles (choosing title proper, recording variant titles, notes on source of title) should be in one place--or at least be referenced in one area. Rules that apply only to particular kinds of resources would be indicated as such.

One advantage of the existing format of AACR2 is that cataloguers who chiefly deal with one format can easily check the general rules and the specifics of that type of material, and not have to worry about details that do not relate to the material they are describing. In the proposed format, cataloguers have to wade through many details in the rules that really are not relevant to them to find the few parts that are significant. It makes working with the document very unwieldy and it is much more time-consuming to look things up than it currently is. If the JSC insists on this format, area 3 and area 5 would benefit if they had a very brief general introduction, with the specifics under the appropriate content/medium.

Format

Serials cataloguers, who have a vested interest in chapter A2, prefer that sections A1-A3 be combined into one chapter divided by area. With the division of content and media rules into separate sections and chapters, the organization of the code is already quite complex. We think it would be easier to include specific rules for type of issuance with all of the other general rules, since they can apply to all types of content and media. With only 16 pages in A2 and 12 pages in A3, moving these rules back into the 104 pages of A1 would not add that much to A1, and would be much easier to use. It would be good to put the serials cataloguing rules back into the mainstream of cataloguing rules. Many of us went further to say that chapters B and C also be combined into that same area-by-area arrangement. Within each "area" chapter there could be general rules followed by the specific rules based on different modes of issuance, then specific rules based on content and carrier, all appropriately labelled for quick reference.

When you think about our other documentation and consider what is easy to use, the MARC format and the *CONSER Editing Guide* arrange information by MARC tag, the *CCM* arranges information by area of the description and special topics. We find these documents much easier to reference than the revised part 1 which uses a completely different approach

and divides (rather than groups) information relating to a single area of description into different chapters based on a classification of the type of rule. It's not intuitive and not easy to use.

Putting the cataloguing rules in a format more like a data dictionary might be more in tune with current usage and other standards, though there a lot more details in AACR than in some metadata schemes. Even some specific examples would be easier to read in an online display format, e.g. in A1.0D1 and A1.0D2.

A transition table giving the AACR2 rule number and its AACR3 counterpart would be helpful.

Principles:

Generalization

Specificity

Non-redundancy

Terminology

In general, the language of the text seems filled with library jargon and is only comprehensible to those already familiar with AACR2. We do not see it easily being used by other communities, despite the fact that that is one of the stated objectives. It would be helpful if there were some way to give the AACR2 equivalence of some of the terms.

For many, though not all, serials cataloguers, the term “multipart” has come to be equated with “finite-ness” and not just “part-ness” and it is now difficult to think of serials as being one type of multipart.

We generally found the term “ancillary” more confusing than the existing use of “accompanying” material – and would prefer the return to the latter because it is “plain English.”

Changing “microform” to “micrographic” seems like an unnecessary change, unless it is meant to imply something more than just microform -- which doesn't appear to be the intention.

Reference structure

B. Functional Requirements

Objectives:

Responsiveness to user needs

Online display examples would be helpful. If catalogue card or paragraph display examples are desired for book catalogues or bibliographies, perhaps online display examples could also be added.

Cost efficiency

Format independence**Principles:****Differentiation****Sufficiency****Relationships****Representation****Accuracy****Uniformity****Common usage****2. Organization of the rules****Scope and organization of chapter A1 – General rules for description****Scope and organization of chapter A2 – Resources issued in successive parts**

The concepts of “continuing resources” and whether they are successively issued (i.e., serials) or integrating (e.g., updating Web sites) were removed from the rules. It would be helpful to add some of this general information to the introduction or a “generalities” chapter as an explanation of the varying forms of issuance that a cataloguer is likely to encounter: continuing resources, successively issued resources, integrating resources, etc.

The concept of a “continuing resource” is important for many reasons – not least because serial cataloguers believe there are subtle differences in the descriptive cataloguing for finite vs. continuing resources:

- There is a different mindset to describing a continuing resource than a finite resource. It is less important, and maybe even less desirable, to transcribe other title information for continuing resources because the other title information changes over time.
- There is a different approach to notes in describing continuing resources. Source of title note is more important with continuing resources because the title may be different on different sources, and may change in different ways on those sources over time. If the source of title is not specified, it may be difficult to tell whether there has been a major or minor change in the title.
- Some areas of description which have been used for continuing resources may not be necessary or even desirable for other resources that are issued successively. There was some discussion at one of the CC:DA meetings at

Midwinter about whether numeric and/or alphabetic designation was really appropriate for multi-volume monographs.

SPECIFIC RULES

A1.0A1

The term “focus of the description” seems confusing and awkward-sounding. If the wording “resource being described” is substituted whenever the phrase “focus of the description” is found, the resulting sentences are much easier to understand. If the term must be kept, at least define it in the glossary. We considered other possible terms, but none were totally satisfactory: basis (the term we’ve been using); starting point; focal point; foundation; source, etc.

A1.0A1.c)

The wording on selecting first/earliest issue/part has been generalized. According to this rule, for the focus of description we select the source "pertaining" to the first issue or part. Beyond that statement, there isn't a specific statement about preferring first/earliest issue over a source associated with the whole serial or a range of serials (e-serial issue versus the entire Web site.). Will this be clear enough? AACR2 12.0B1 states clearly to prefer a source associated with the first or earliest issue rather than the whole resource and it may be helpful to add a sentence: "Generally prefer the first (or earliest) issue or part over a source associated with the whole resource or with a range of more than one issue or part." For remote e-serials this has been an important clarification, a home page that houses issues of an e-serial may have a different title from what appears on sources more closely associated with the actual first/earliest issue, e.g., a table of contents for an individual issue. The title that appears at the issue level may generally have more correspondence with the print version than the Web page title.

A1.0A2

The choice of chief source has been generalized in A1.0A2 to use a “prominent” source and, if there are more than one, to use the most complete source. Although the idea of generalizing this rule for all formats may be a good one, it does not work for periodicals, for which the cover is generally chosen as the chief source under AACR2 rules and for which the contents page will more likely be chosen as the most complete source under the new rules. Such a change in the choice of chief source may cause confusion, particularly for new cataloguers, who might incorrectly think there has been a major change in title, when there really hasn't -- when looking at an existing catalogue record with a new title (for her institution) in hand. We suggest reverting to the prescribed sources when a title page is lacking for serials – as worded in AACR2 12.0B2. It would also be helpful to add: "Specify the source used as the title page substitute in a note." with a reference to A1.7B4. Dividing A1.0A2 in a manner similar to A1.0A1 for Focus of the description would then also be helpful.

A couple of statements in this rule seem to be a bit unclear:

- 1). If the information in two or more sources varies in degree of completeness, the cataloguer is instructed to choose the source that provides the title proper and the most complete edition and publishing information. Does that mean the cataloguer would at times choose the verso of the t.p. or the masthead as the chief source?
- 2). The chief source of information is stated to be either “unitary in nature (e.g., a title page) or may be collective (e.g., a title page and its verso).” If this is so, does “collective” cover other combinations, such as cover and masthead?

A1.0A2 emphasizes a prominent, formal source. For direct access e-serials, this could be interpreted to mean a preference for the physical carrier or label--depending on what is meant by prominent. This is less clear than the directive given in AACR2 12.0B2 that says to prefer the physical carrier or label for direct access e-serials, since A1.0A2 says that if information in two prominent sources varies in degree of completeness, then you should prefer the source that provides the most complete information. It's possible that the carrier or label might not have the most complete information and, again, this could cause confusion in dealing with a serial publication over time.

A1.0A4

This rule is confusing for cataloguing periodicals in particular. A1.0A4 describes what to do when there is no chief source or when the information to be included is not available from the chief source. Rule A1.0A4 would apply only if there is no title page, cover, label, caption, other preliminaries, colophon, and other internal parts of the resource, or if none of those sources have a title. It would be preferable to include the list of choices for serial title page substitutes when a title page is missing so that all serials cataloguers are choosing the same chief source, as given in AACR2 12.0B2.

A1.0A5

Using the chief source of other information and other preliminaries for the Publication, distribution, etc. area may lead to a return to a lot of bracketing for serials cataloguers – something we thought we had finally eliminated by using the entire resource as the prescribed source for this area in AACR2 12.0B3. This will also be true for remote e-serials- publication information often comes from sources other than the issue. Given the number of possible sources and variation of tile presented in e-serials, this is a problem.

A1.0A5 says "Any source within the resource" is the prescribed source of information for series, which may be easier than trying to use the existing "Series title page, analytical title page, cover, caption, masthead, editorial pages, colophon, rest of the resource" in the AACR2 12.9B3, but could lead to variations in how a series is recorded, since series are sometimes recorded differently on different sources in a given issue.

A1.0F7

This general rule instructs the cataloguer to repeat letters or words that are given once on the source, but that are meant to be read more than once. This statement should be expanded to include numbers/dates. Currently, the repetition of numbers/dates is covered only in LCRI 12.3C4.

A1.1A2. para.2

The wording of this paragraph does not tell the cataloguer what to do if there is a part number, but no part title. Perhaps change to:

"Precede the enumeration or alphabetic designation of a section or supplement (see A1.1B8) by a full stop. Precede the title of a section or supplement by a comma, unless the title of the section or supplement is not preceded by an enumeration or alphabetic designation, in which case precede the title by a full stop."

OR:

"Precede the title of a section or supplement (see A1.1B8) by a full stop, unless there is enumeration or alphabetic designation in addition to or instead of the section title, in which case

precede the enumeration or alphabetic designation by a full stop and precede the title, if there is one, by a comma."

A1.1B1

When the transcription rule and rule on inaccuracies was split into 2 rules, the examples were removed. Please restore serial examples from AACR2 12.1B1 to A1.1B1, since remaining examples are generally not serial-like.

A1.1B4

A1.1B4 provides for more consistency for all forms of issuance on determining whether or not a corporate body is part of title proper.

A1.1B7

Serials cataloguers hope that moving this rule on full form vs. initialism as choice of title from 12.1B2 to the general chapter will mean that monograph and serial cataloguers will look at title pages more similarly. This may improve consistency in treatment of title transcription, especially for conference publications where monograph and serial cataloguers tend to look at title presentation quite differently.

A.1.1B8

Having the rules on supplementary titles generalized in this rule (from AACR2 12.1B4-12.1B6) for all forms of issuance provides for consistency of treatment.

A1.1C

Many serials cataloguers prefer that the GMD be treated as a separate data element rather than being recorded as part of the title area, as has been discussed at CC:DA meetings.

Regarding the form of the GMD, many of us are in favour of the new "digital" as it seems more current than the existing "electronic resources."

A1.1E5

This rule is a problem (even in AACR2) when the other title information pertains to elements of the title proper before the very last element (cf. the final example, "Recreation information : opportunities for people with intellectual disability. News sheet [GMD]"). Either the other title information should be recorded in a note (instead of in the title and statement of responsibility area) or there needs to be a uniform title created that eliminates the other title information. There is already widespread misunderstanding of the nature of section/part titles, so that they are often, or maybe usually, recorded as other title information, particularly by monographic cataloguers. Such constructions as the one in the example can be problematic in automated systems, not to mention the possibility of misreading the "catalog entry form" if the title is being used as an added entry or linking entry in another record (i.e., only part of the title proper instead of the entire title proper may be put in the added entry or linking entry).

A1.1F1 para.2.

This sentence would be better included as part of the first paragraph, since it includes instruction that is implied in the examples under the previous paragraph.

The addition of some serial examples from AACR2 12.1F1 would be helpful.

A1.1F7

This rule has the same problem as A1.1E5, but the ramifications are even worse and there are no

examples illustrating the problematic construction that would result. Again, the remedy would be to put statements of responsibility into the notes area, or to create a uniform title.

A1.2A3

The term defined in the glossary is “Facsimile reproduction,” so it may be confusing here to label this rule “Facsimiles and reproductions.” In the first sentence, it would be clearer to say "as well as edition information" rather than "as well as that information."

A1.2B3

In A1.2B3, the enumeration of types of edition statements to record (e.g., local edition statements, language editions) has better wording than exists in AACR2 12.2B1), but the instruction on which types of edition statements to record for serials is lacking – and we think it should be added here. Also, AACR2 12.2B1a)ii) special interest edition statements, and AACR2 12.2B1a)v) reprint or reissue statements indicating a reissue or revision of the serial as a whole are lacking in A1.2B3 or A2.2B3.

At least one example including a date would be helpful, e.g. "Draft, Jan. 2000." It would be more helpful to have the date included with the information it pertains to, instead of simply given by itself in a note.

A1.2D1

Serial examples from AACR2 12.2D1 would be helpful.

A1.3A1

The attempt to “generalize” the numbering rules in AACR2 12.3A1 has resulted in mixing numbering rules with mentions of other area 3 uses in A1.3A1, such as musical presentation statement and mathematical data for cartographic resources. While this may be confusing for users of the musical presentation statement, etc., it has also left the numbering area with no general application rule of its own, only sub-rules.

An important general instruction was removed (underlined text): “Give this area for serials (with the exception of unnumbered monographic series) if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part.” The general “if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part” instruction should be restored, in the rule stating the general application of the numbering area, since we believe it is necessary to have the first and/or last issue in hand when you record numbering information. If a version of the first paragraph of draft A1.3A1 continues to be used, the general instruction can be incorporated there: “ ... this area is used for numbering information if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part ... “

Multipart monograph examples would be useful.

A1.3B1.

It may help to clarify the rule for recording spans of numbers/dates, according to the instructions in the LCRI, i.e. ("In a numeric and/or alphabetic designation for a span of numbers, replace a hyphen with a forward slash (e.g., give "no. 1-2" as "no. 1/2")." This may need to actually be given under the punctuation rule in A1.3A4, even though A1.3B1 says to record the designation “but not necessarily the same punctuation.” It makes more sense to routinely substitute or omit punctuation as needed to clarify. The double hyphen separating the first and last issue is not sufficiently visibly different in many displays using proportional fonts. "1995/1996-1996/1997" is much easier to read than "1995-1996--1996-1997". This would also require the modification of some examples throughout A1.3.

Multipart monograph examples would be useful.

A1.3C2

It would be helpful to include a provision for choosing the Gregorian/Julian date when both non-Gregorian/Julian and Gregorian/Julian dates appear.

A1.3C4, 6th & 7th example

One (or both) of these examples should use a slash instead of a dash. The current AACR2 rule 12.3C4 shows one example with a slash. This is similar to the example in A1.3C1 where 1999-2000 is changed to 1999/2000. The same principle would apply with 1998-1-2004-1 being confusing when it ceases publication.

AL.3E1 – Alternate numbering systems

This rule repeats the current AACR2 12.3E1: if the resource has more than one separate system of designation, record the systems in the order in which they are presented. The LCRI for this rule, however, states that preference should be given to recording the volume-and-number system first – and this is general serials cataloguing practice. Please consider whether LCRI treatment is preferable to the rule.

Please add an example to A1.3E1 that includes numerical and chronological designations, as well as alternative numbering.

A1.3G1, para.2

Please add an example to demonstrate how the series numbering should be included in closed-off enumeration.

A1.4A1 Sources of information

For serials, as in A1.0A5, it would be helpful to be able to record information for area 5 from anywhere in the resource without needing to bracket the information.

Serials cataloguers would like to again ask for repeatable area 4's to address changes in publication. It would especially helpful for providing the current publisher – information which now gets buried in the notes area. Although the concept of repeatable 260 fields has been approved for use in MARC21 format, we believe handling this situation via the format seems inconsistent with the principle that the format should reflect the rules, not, in effect, create new rules. Putting one publisher (either first or latest) in the body of the description and relegating the others to a note does not necessarily make sense. Even though we base the description on the first issue, we routinely record both beginning and ending publication dates, we routinely record both beginning and ending issue designations, so why can't the whole set of places and publishers also be recorded in the body of the record? That would eliminate the issue of whether the first or last publisher is more important or useful. For example, we could have an area 4 description appear as:

. -- New York : Elsevier, 1978-1991 ; Cambridge : University of Cambridge Press, 1991-1993 ; New York : Springer, 1994-

as represented in MARC as:

260 New York : \$b Elsevier, \$c 1978-1991

260 2 Cambridge : \$b University of Cambridge Press, \$c 1991-1993

260 3 New York : \$b Springer, \$c 1994-

A1.4C1

The wording “on the source of information” replaced "on the chief source of information". Is this meant to be a different way of saying "on the resource" or on the “chief source of information?” This seems less clear than the existing rules and, even if the wording were returned to its original form, there would still be more bracketing if the prescribed sources of information for this area is left as in the draft.

A1.4C6 and A1.4D7 – Lack of place and publisher

These two rules state that if no place of publication or publisher can be determined, then no name will be recorded. Presumably, “s.l.” and “s.n.” will no longer be used. But then how will another cataloguer/user of the record be able to determine, especially for continuing resources, whether the information was not available, or was omitted by mistake. Both of these rules should include a statement that if the information is omitted, it should be noted. These have negative implications for interpreting an ISBD or online display of this information. If only one of the two elements (place or name) is present, it might be difficult sometimes to determine whether the element present in the record is a place or a name.

If “s.l.” is biting the dust and nothing is to be substituted for it when there is no place of publication known or guessable, will the field begin with the colon that normally precedes publisher? Instruction and example(s) are needed.

The suggestion was made that we could use what is used in citations according to the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 2003 edition: “n.p.” for no place is given; if publisher is unknown, use just the place and date; “n.d.” if date is unknown -- though one could always give a “guessed at” date in brackets. The use of “n.p.” to indicate “no place” would satisfy the need to distinguish something which is unpublished from something for which the place of publication is unknown. If the publisher is unknown, it could be omitted. Either a place of publication or “n.p.” would indicate that it is, in fact, published.

A1.4D2

Perhaps add instruction and examples of publishers other than commercial ones to better define “the shortest form in which it can be understood and identified internationally.” Are corporate hierarchies to be transcribed in their entirety? Is the substitution of an acronym for a corporate name ever permissible, and if so, when?

A1.4D7

See A1.4C6 above. If neither a place nor a publisher available, what will the field contain? A date preceded by a comma? If first issue is not in hand and there is no date available, will the field simply be omitted? Instruction and examples needed.

A1.4F7

Rule A1.4F7 says to supply an approximate date of publication if no date of publication, etc., appears on the source of information. It does not refer from there to chapter A2 for Resources issued in successive parts or to chapter A3 for Integrating resources. However, in those chapters, it says to supply the beginning and/or ending publication date if it can be readily ascertained only as an option. A1.4F7 appears to say you should always supply an approximate date of

publication. Instead, we think it should specify that it applies to single volume monographs (and to multi-volume monographs if it actually does) and it should refer to A2.4F1 and A3.4F1 for serials and integrating resources (or include the information there for serials and integrating resources if A2 and A3 are incorporated into A1).

A1.5E4

The term "Dependent supplements" in A1.5E4 is a little confusing. "Dependent supplement" is not in the Glossary, but Supplement is. According to the Glossary, a Supplement is "A resource, usually issued separately, that complements one previously issued ..." How can you have a dependent resource that complements another resource?

Could this rule perhaps be combined with A1.5E1.b)?

A1.6A3

The last line in A1.6A3 is unclear. The 3rd line says, "Precede each parallel title by an equals sign." Then the last line says, "For the use of the equals sign to precede parallel statements, see the appropriate rules." It would help to specify the appropriate rules.

A1.6B1

Paragraph 2 states, "If the title proper includes numbering as an integral part of the title proper of the series, transcribe the numbering as part of the title proper." Presumably this does not apply to serials, for which different numbers may appear on different issues, but that is not clear from the rules. In such a case, the number needs to be taken out of the series title statement and replaced with the mark of omission, and the number put after the series title statement.

This rule needs a reference to A2.6G1.

A1.6B2

The two paragraphs in this rule seem to give varying instructions for the same situation. Please clarify.

A1.6D1

This rule states, "Record other title information of a series only if it provides valuable information identifying the series." What if the other title information is an acronym? Should it be recorded? Since series are serials, should the rules for series be the same as the rules for serials?

A1.6H4

The wording would be clearer if "second" were changed to "separate" in both instances.

A1.6K. Change in series statement

The meaning of the second paragraph is not clear.

A1.7A3 and A1.7A4

These and other rules which address the citation of related works in notes are not in sync. The former instructs one to use title proper and statement of responsibility and gives the example "Adaptation of: Germinie Lacerteux / Edmond et Jules de Goncourt"; the latter says to prefer "the title or name-title under which the resource is entered or would be entered" unless it is not possible to determine what this would be. It is certainly possible to determine the name-title under which *Germinie Lacerteux* is entered, so these are contradictory. Even within A1.7A4 the

option is given to cite *Kipps* by H.G. Wells either way. If either pattern of citation is equally valid, then the rules should say so; if the preference actually is for entry/title, then the examples should reflect that.

A1.7B.

The rule says to "Make notes in the order in which they are listed here," which is a practice that serials cataloguers do not follow – and are not likely to. We endorse the new language for this note as suggested by Carroll Davis in the Consistency T.F. report:

A1.7B. Notes

Order of notes. Make notes in the order that meets the needs of users. The sequence in which the following rules are given is one such order. Make a particular note first when it has been decided that note is of primary importance. In describing a *reproduction* of a manifestation of the same work (e.g., a text reproduced in microform; a manuscript reproduced in book form; a set of maps reproduced as slides), record the notes relating to the reproduction and then the notes relating to the original manifestation. Combine the notes relating to the original in one note, giving the details in the order of the areas to which they relate (see A1.7B26).

A1.7B4

A1.7B4 represents a problem for all cataloguers -- by omitting in most cases the note on source of the title proper, it can make it almost impossible to determine when one is looking at the same item or a closely related item. Although draft A1.7B4 references AACR2 1.7B3, the latter contains no instructions itself, just two examples; rather the instructions are contained in the corresponding .7B3 rules of chapters 2-12. The result is a fundamental departure from established practice. AACR3 A1.7B4 instructs the cataloguer to make a note on the source of the title proper only when it is other than the chief source (i.e. only when it is external to the item itself), but the corresponding rules in AACR2 chapters 2-12 require notes in all but the most exceptional circumstances (e.g. whenever the source is other than the title page [chapters 2 and 12]) or even always (e.g., electronic resources). If the choice of chief source remains as in the draft AACR3 version, it would be preferable to add to A1.7B4 or A2.7B4, "For serials, make a note on the source of the title proper if it is other than the title page" or "For serials, always make a note on the source of the title proper." Also, if it is still the intention to make a source of title note for all electronic serials, either a statement of that fact or a reference to another rule is needed here.

A1.7B5

In A1.7B5, some wording from 12.7B4.1 was lost (in underlined portion): "Make notes on titles other than the title proper borne by the resource, and changes to such titles, if considered to be important." This needs to be restored in A1.7B5 or added to A2.7B5 (at present, the latter only addresses changes in title proper). One could say adding the need to add this phrase is arguable, since draft AACR3 in A1.7A1 and A1.7A3 does generally acknowledge that notes may reflect changes over time and may apply only to some parts but not all, but there is value in restoring the language to the title note rule. If "change" phenomena are only to be covered in A2, then it would be helpful to add A2.7B5.2: "Make notes on changes in titles borne by the resource other than the title proper if considered to be important." This may also be true for integrating resources -- if there is a change to a title borne by the resource other than the title proper, e.g., there was a title

other than the title proper on a former iteration that is no longer on the current iteration, the note would be revised to give the date information when that title appeared (using the original viewed on date).

The heading for A1.7B5 is "Variations in title" and then it describes "titles by which the resource is commonly known," which are not variations in title, but just other titles, generally in a shortened form, by which users have come to call a resource. It would be better if this were actually divided into two sentences as in AACR2 12.7B41.

A1.7B7

The first example looks like it belongs in A1.7B5 (Variations in title), rather than here.

A1.7B9

This rule greatly improves instructions for providing information on relationships for monographs -- though monograph cataloguers may not agree this is helpful or necessary.

A1.7B9.d), A1.7B14

The reference to describe supplements catalogued separately as instructed in 1.9 has been generalized in A1.7B9. The wording is duplicative in these two different rules and they "beg" for simplification. Not only is the duplication here, A1.7B14 has a see also reference to C7.7B14. In C7.7B14 it says "Make notes on details of any ancillary material for a resource available by remote access if not recorded in the technical description (see C7.5A1 and C7.5E1)." In C7.5A1 it says, "Do not record a technical description for a digital resource that is available by remote access unless the option at C7.5B1 is applied. Otherwise, record technical details in notes (see C7.7B13 and C7.7B15). See also C7.5E1." Please clarify/simplify these rules.

Cross-references are needed between A1.7B9.d) and A1.7B14.

A1.7B10

A couple of serial examples from AACR2 12.7B16 would be helpful in this rule.

A1.7B12.1

In keeping with the proposed changes to A1.4C6 and A1.4D7, A1.7B12.1 should include an example citing the absence of place or publisher.

A1.7B13

Serial examples need to be added from AACR2 12.7B12.1.

A1.7B14

The underlined portion of this rule was removed from AACR2 12.7B13: "Give details of accompanying material neither mentioned in the physical description area nor given a separate description ... " That is, A1.7B14 refers only to ancillary material not mentioned in the technical description and does not mention ancillary material given a separate description. This is a problem because serials cataloguers (and others, too) must keep track of whether materials are being recorded at the end of area 5, in notes, or in separate descriptions. There is an important distinction to make. If the accompanying material is cataloged on a separate record, there should not be a note like "Accompanied by CD-ROM". There would be a note like "Also issued on CD-ROM", but that's covered under A1.7B10. Please restore to A1.7B14: "Make notes on details of accompanying material neither mentioned in the physical description area nor given a separate description ... "

A1.7B14. paragraph 2

We suggest changing "a regular feature" to "a recurring feature."

A1.7B20

The comparable AACR2 1.7B17 consists only of an example of what a summary note would look like if it were included in the record. This proposed rule adds an instruction to "Provide a brief objective summary of the content ... unless another part of the description provides enough information." Is the intent really to require that information be added? Perhaps this could be softened to "a brief objective summary of the content *may* be provided." Or it could be made an optional rule.

Please add serial examples from AACR2 12.7B18.

A1.7B21

Part of AACR2 12.7B19 was removed in this rule: "For serials, make notes on inserts, other serials included in the serial, and important special items with specific titles. Do not give contents notes for monographic series." The first sentence may now be covered by the generalized first sentence of A1.7B21: "List the contents of the resource, either selectively or fully, if they are considered to be important." However, it would be helpful to add back (in A1.7B21 or add A2.7B21) the "Do not give contents notes for monographic series" instruction, unless this is going to be included in analysis rules elsewhere in the rules.

The second paragraph in A1.7B21 says "When recording titles formally, take them from the head of the part to which they refer rather than from contents lists, etc." Should this rule specify that it refers to manuscripts only: "For manuscripts, when recording titles formally, take them from the head of the part to which they refer ..."?

A1.7B24

The serial example needs to be restored from 12.7B20. Superintendent of Documents numbers for serial titles have a slightly different construction than those for monographs.

A1.7B28.

A1.7B28 has two different types of content and it would be preferable to split it into two rules. Including library holdings as part of the bibliographic record no longer seems necessary, although this may be a necessary instruction for book catalogues.

A1.8C1

Provisions for adding notes for abbreviated titles, including the abbreviated key title, should be added to this rule. They can be very helpful for searching online catalogues for citations.

The current rules are still card-centric in providing instructions to display the ISSN and key title as a single note. In checking a few online catalogues, none displayed the key title as a note with the ISSN and key title following the equals sign. Perhaps provide the option of giving them in separate notes?

A1.8E1

We agree that it is a good idea to make qualifications to the standard number optional.

A2.0A1 (and A3.0A1)

The draft no longer addresses "resources that exhibit characteristics of serials but whose duration is limited," which is technically explainable from the fact that the scope of chapter A2 now embraces these whether they are called multipart or serials, so it may be argued there is no need for specific instructions. The problem is that these have been cataloged as serials since 2002, per an international harmonization with the ISSN and ISBD communities. This is consequential, since it determines record format, distribution channels, and ISSN eligibility for these resources. Reportedly, the ISSN system has found cataloging and registering these serial-like finites as serials to be a successful change; so the AACR community does not want to change their cataloging unilaterally. It is problematic how and where the cataloging code might address this when there is no longer a chapter with a scope rule specific to "serials." Even AACR2 rule 12.0A only states that the chapter 12 (continuing resources) rules apply to serial-like finites, without specifically saying they are catalogued as serials; but catalogers have understood the latter to be the case, since these resources are not plausibly continuing resources. Chapter A2 and rule A2.0A1 cover more alternatives, so conclusions would be less clear. Specific instruction to catalog these resources as serials is in LCRI 1.0 (which calls them "publications of limited duration"). Should this guideline remain LC/PCC policy or be incorporated in the cataloging code? Is there an appropriate place other than a chapter scope rule for this instruction to be given?

A2.1F16

We suggest re-wording of the first part of the first sentence to: "If a responsible person or body is added or deleted on a subsequent issue or part..." As written, the sentence refers to adding a person or body already recorded.

A2.5B1

Unless someone can explain convincingly why this policy has been changed, we would prefer to have the following instruction restored in A2.5B1, end of first paragraph (and added to C1.5B1): "For *printed resources*, use the specific material designation v." Perhaps change wording to: "For printed serials, use the specific material designation v."

Serials cataloguers were somewhat divided over whether the extent should be called "physical units" or "bibliographic units." Some of us thought perhaps it should be worded "physical units as originally released" (though even that could still be confusing for serials issued in volumes and numbers). It is not always possible to tell with bound materials what was the actual number of "physical units" originally published.

The best thing about the draft rule is that adding the number of physical units is optional, since serials cataloguers find many reasons for not adding it.

There needs to be a link to part 2 on when to create a new record if there is a change in SMD -- unless that is going to be changed as a criteria for a new record.

Should the term "publication" be used (twice) in the last paragraph or should it be "resource"? We weren't sure if this was oversight or intentional.

A2.5C14.

The last sentence should be worded "If other technical ..." (not "physical")

A2.6G1

This rule states, "For serials, do not record series numbering if each issue or part is separately numbered within the series." However, in A2.7B17.1 (as was done in AACR2), there is a

somewhat conflicting instruction to "Make notes on details of the numbering within a series if the numbering varies from issue to issue and is considered to be important." It would be helpful if A2.6G1 said, "For serials, generally do not record series numbering ..." as there are times when it is very valuable to indicate the numbering within the series, e.g., as when you are cataloguing a long run as a serial analytic.

A reference in A2.6G1 to A2.7B17.1 would be helpful.

A2.7B17.2

It would be helpful to add wording to this rule (as is used in A2.6K1): "this change cannot be stated clearly in the series area" in the first sentence: "Make notes on additions, deletions, or changes in series statements that occur after the first/earliest issue or part, if this change cannot be stated clearly in the series area and if considered to be important."

A2.7B9

The rule for "Issued with:" notes from AACR2 12.7B22 is lacking from the draft Part I. However, A1.7B25 "With" notes are not really the same thing as the serial "Issued with:" note. A1.7B25 applies to "a component part of a resource lacking a collective title"; if that language is principled, then that rule cannot cover serial "Issued with" relationships. Serials may be issued separately at some times and with other serials at other times; they may be "issued with" different other serials at different times. There is no "resource lacking a collective title" of which any of the serials involved may be said to be a "component." Any "component part of a resource lacking a collective title" occurs only at the issue level, not at the level of the serial resource being described. Even the MARC format has two different bibliographic fields, 777 defined for serial "Issued with:" notes, field 501 for "With:" notes. We would prefer that a separate rule for "Issued with:" notes be restored or add this to A2.7B9. Alternatively, rule A1.7B25 would have to be changed fundamentally if it were to cover both current "With:" and "Issued with:" notes and there would probably have to be language explaining the usage with serials.

A2.7B12.1

According to the heading for this rule (which copies the existing AACR2 rule 12.7B11.1), it should be concerned with matters related to the publishing, distribution, etc. area. It does that, covering the suspension of publication, and "notes on the beginning and/or ending dates of publication not recorded in the publication, distribution, etc. area." A couple of the examples, however, go beyond this, mentioning volumes and numbers, i.e., *designation* information. This, apparently, has been done because the code lacks any provision for recording designation information when the first (or last) issue is not in hand. Prior to the 2002 revision of AACR2, even these examples were not in the rule. In the absence of any guidance in the rules, cataloguers have traditionally used the unformatted 362 field to cover both publication and designation information. The *CONSER Cataloging Manual* (in module 8.1.1.b) does explicitly discuss the provision of notes for beginning and/or ending numbering information. It would be helpful if the new rules could include specific guidance both for notes on publication dates and for notes on designations.

A2.7B13.1

Consider combining this rule with the "suspended" rule in A2.7B12.1 – they seem to have very similar content, though it could be considered a slightly different situation, e.g. a projected 10-volume set that stops publishing after 6 volumes.

A2.7B27

Name of A2.7B27 should be "Issue or part described" (remove "iteration")

A2.7B27.1

While this rule does reflect the current AACR2 12.7B23, the rule's LCRI requires that "Description based on" and "Latest issue consulted" information be given in separate notes. Perhaps reconsider whether they should be combined in this rule, because "Description based on" notes are often combined with "title from ..." notes. To add the "latest issue consulted" note might then be confusing.

A2.11A (and A3.11A)

AACR2 12.10A states "Do not use the 'multilevel' structure ... for the description of [sections](#) of a resource. Describe such sections as separate resources ... " Unless someone explains convincingly why there was a change in policy, we would like this rule restored in A2.11A (and A3.11A).

A3.5C14

We suggest slightly different wording: "If other technical details are added, omitted, or changed on a subsequent iteration, change the technical description area to reflect the current iteration and, if the change is considered to be important, make a note."

A3.6K1

Again, we suggest slightly different wording: "If a series is added, deleted, or changed on a subsequent iteration, change the series area to reflect the current iteration and, if the change is considered to be important, make a note."

A3.7B27

The name of A3.7B27 should be corrected to: "Iteration described."

C1.5B2.1.16.

This rule says "If the number of bibliographic volumes differs from the number of physical volumes, record the number of bibliographic volumes followed by 'in' and the number of physical volumes." Does this refer only to volumes as they are received bound or does it also refer to the way a library binds the volumes? Serials cataloguers do not want to return to this practice, because it is not always possible to determine what were the number of physical volumes originally.

C7.5B1.

New examples using the terms in Table 2 on pages A1-58 and A1-59 are needed.

C7.7B

There is no mention here or in A1.7B4 about always providing on a note of the source of the title proper for remote access digital resources, as is currently done per AACR2 9.7B3. This is a helpful note for verifying that another cataloguer is looking at the same source if there is a question of a variant title, or a minor or major change in title.

Glossary

Direct access (Digital resources) vs. Remote access (Digital resources) - If a computer file is used via a floppy disk which is inserted into one computer and then shared with other computers via a local computer network, is that Direct access or Remote access? I think whichever it is should be stated in the glossary.

Title frame - Shouldn't the title frame contain the title? It doesn't say so in the glossary. It just says "A frame containing written or printed material not part of the subject content of the resource." It seems to me there might be another frame containing written or printed material which is not part of the subject content but it would not be the title frame because it doesn't contain the title.

XI. Typographical and grammatical errors, etc.

Please reference errors, etc., in the form: [page number] - [rule number] - [paragraph or example number]

p. A1-14 -- A.1.1A1- 2nd paragraph. "Transcribe the data as they appear (no "s" on the end) or "data as it appears"

p. A1-6, last paragraph before A1.0A2, last sentence - "the content of the resources itself" should be "the content of the resource itself", i.e., no "s" on resource.

p. C7-3, in C7.5B1, the paragraph beginning "Optionally", 2nd line – "A1.59" should be "A1-59" (referring to page number rather than section number).

Spacing after open hyphens: the latest version of AACR2 changed the spacing after an open hyphen from three spaces to one. In the proposed rules, however, the gap has reverted to three spaces, as found in rules A1.3F1, A1.3G1, A2.7B5.1, A2.7B7.1, and A2.7B8.2. Is this intentional?